Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 03614 01 OF 02 071942Z

66
ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 EUR-12 H-02 INR-07

IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 BIB-01

USIE-00 INRE-00 NSCE-00 SSO-00 MC-02 /085 W
---------- 079534
O R 071850Z JUL 75
FM USMISSION NATO
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2592
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE
INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA IMMEDIATE
AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 3614

E.O. 11652: GDS
TAGS: PARM, NATO
SUBJECT: MBFR: OPTION III: SPC MEETING JULY 7

REF: A) USNATO 3560 DTG 031310Z JULY 75; B) STATE 158900

SUMMARY: SPC MET MORNING AND AFTERNOON OF JULY 7 ON PARAS 1 TO 3 OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE TO AHG ON OPTION III. MAIN DEVELOPMENTS OF THE DAY WERE: LONDON HAS REITERATED ITS SUPPORT FOR SPECIFYING COMMON CEILING IN PHASE I; FRG REP INDICATED TO US THAT FRG IS RECONSIDERING ITS POSITION ON THIS SUBJECT; AND BELGIUM PROPOSED THAT THE ALLIES GIVE THE OTHER SIDE NO FIGURE ON NUCLEAR ELEMENTS IN OPTION III WHEN FIRST PRESENTING IT (THIS IDEA COMES FROM DAVIGNON); AT THE END OF THE DAY, SPC AGREED AD REFERENDUM ON A REVISED VERSION OF PARAS 1 TO 3 OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE, WITH FEW BRACKETS, ACTION REQUESTED: GUIDANCE ON LATEST VERSION OF PARAS 1 TO 3 BY THURSDAY, JULY 10. END SUMMARY

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 03614 01 OF 02 071942Z

1. UK REP (LOGAN) SAID LONDON HAD CAREFULLY CONSIDERED ARGUMENTS AGAINST FURTHER SPECIFYING THE COMMON CEILING IN PHASE I, HIS INSTRUCTIONS TODAY STATED THAT UK AUTHORITIES ARE STILL UNCONVINCED THAT IT WOULD BE UNWISE TO PRESS THE EAST FOR FURTHER

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006

SPECIFICITY. THE ALLIES NEED TO GET ASSURANCE OF EASTERN
ACCEPTANCE BOTH OF THE COMMON CEILING, AND THAT THE COMMON
CEILING WOULD NOT BE PUSHED TOO LOW. EASTERN ACCEPTANCE OF THE
COMMON CEILING CONCEPT ALONE RAISES THE POSSIBILITY OF ENDLESS
DEBATE IN PHASE II, WHICH IS AS GREAT A DANGER AS PREMATURE
CONSIDERATION OF PHASE II ISSUES.

2. BELGIN REP (WILLOT) SAID THAT IT WAS NOT OPTION III THAT
WAS RAISING THE QUESTION OF ALLOCATION OF PHASE II REDUCTIONS,
THE EAST HAS ALREADY RAISED THIS ISSUE IN THE FORM OF THE DEBATE
ON PHASE II REDUCTION COMMITMENTS, AND OPTION III WOULD NEITHER
INCREASE NOR DECREASE EASTERN INSISTENCE. NETHERLANDS REP
(MEESMAN) SAID ON A PERSONAL BASIS THAT EVEN IF SPECIFYING THE
COMMON CEILING DOES BRING THE ALLIES FORWARD INTO PHASE II ISSUES,
THIS WOULD BE A PITY, BUT THE ALLIES HAVE TO ACCEPT THE POSSIBILITY,
SINCE ANY OTHER COURSE WOULD UNDULY BURDEN THE PHASE II NEGOTIATIONS.
BELGIAN REP LATER TOLD US PRIVATELY THAT HE AGREED WITH THIS REMARK,
ALTHOUGH HE CONSIDERED IT PREMATURE TO STATE IT IN THE SPC.

3. US REP (PEREZ) REITERATED THE ARGUMENTS THAT SPECIFYING THE
COMMON CEILING IN PHASE I WOULD RAISE ISSUES THE ALLIES WERE
NOT YET PREPARED TO HANDLE, AND THAT EASTERN INTEREST IN
NON-US REDUCTIONS OFFER THE ALLIES SUFFICIENT BARGAINING POWER
FOR PHASE II.

4. FRG REP (HOYNCK) REMAINED SILENT DURING THIS DISCUSSION. THE
DISCUSSION OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE ON THIS ISSUE RESULTED IN THE
FOLLOWING BRACKETED LANGUAGE: "THIS COLLECTIVE COMMON CEILING
(MIGHT) (WOULD) BE SET AT APPROXIMATELY 700,000 SOLDIERS ON
EACH SIDE" (WITH SIMILAR LANGUAGE FOR COMBINED COMMON CEILING
OF 900,000. "MIGHT" OF COURSE REPRESENTS US VIEW. FRG REP STATED
THAT HIS AUTHORITIES HAD NOT YET FINALIZED THEIR POSITION ON
THE CHOICE BETWEEN "WOULD" AND "MIGHT". HE LATER TOLD US PRIVATELY
THAT BONN IS RE-EXAMINING ITS POSITION ON THIS ISSUE. BONN IS
CONSIDERING A SOLUTION WHICH COULD ACCEPT THE US "MIGHT", AND
CONTAIN LANGUAGE IN THE SUPPLEMENT ON ADDITIONAL ASPECTS OF THE
ALLIED POSITION WHICH WOULD GIVE AHG FLEXIBILITY, AND, LIKE THE
SECRET

PRESENT ALLIED NEGOTIATING MANDATE, WOULD NOT REQUIRE AHG TO
INSIST ON AGREEMENT ON A NUMERICAL COMMON CEILING IN PHASE I.
HE SAID FRG PRIORITIES IN DESCENDING ORDER ARE NOW: COLLECTIVE
REDUCTION COMMITMENTS IN PHASE II, AVOIDANCE OF ALLIED ARMAMENTS
REDUCTIONS, AND MORE SPECIFIC COMMON CEILING. HE STRESSED
THAT FRG HAS NOT REACHED FINAL DECISION IN THIS AREA.

5. CANADIAN REP (BARTLEMAN) SAID HIS AUTHORITIES CONSIDERED IT
UNWISE TO SEEK EASTERN AGREEMENT ON A SPECIFIC COMMON CEILING
UNTIL THE ALLIES COULD SEE THE RESULTS OF THE DEFINITIONS
EXERCISE UNDERWAY IN VIENNA, SINCE THAT EXERCISE COULD CHANGE
THE DISPARITIES. BELGIAN REP AGREED AND SUGGESTED THAT IMS MAKE
A FIRST ESTIMATE OF WHAT THE DISPARITIES WOULD LOOK LIKE IN THE

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006

WORST CASE, I.E. UNDER THE EASTERN SYSTEM OF REDEFINITION.
IMS WILL SEEK TO DO SO IN TIME FOR THURSDAY MEETING.

6. BELGIAN REP SAID THAT HIS AUTHORITIES NOW WANTED AHG TO GIVE THE OTHER SIDE NO FIGURES ON NUCLEAR ELEMENTS IN OPTION III WHEN FIRST PRESENTING OPTION III. AHG SHOULD TELL THE EAST THAT THE ALLIES ARE READY TO INCLUDE NUCLEAR ELEMENTS IF THE EAST ACCEPTS THE PRINCIPLE OF THE ALLIED APPROACH, I.E. THE COMMON CEILING AND THE TANK ARMY; IF THE EAST DOES ACCEPT THIS PRINCIPLE, THE ALLIES WILL THEN TELL THE EAST THE QUANTITIES INVOLVED. (BELGIAN REP HAS TOLD US THIS IDEA COMES FROM DAVIGNON.) ITALIAN REP (SPINELLI), WHO FAVORS INTRODUCTION OF OPTION III SERIATIM, AGREED WITH BELGIAN REP.

7. US REP NOTED THAT THIS QUESTION COULD BE DECIDED LATER IN THE CONTEXT OF TACTICS. HE REITERATED US DESIRE TO INTRODUCE OPTION III AS A WHOLE, IN ORDER TO HAVE MAXIMUM IMPACT, AND DISCOURAGE EASTERN DEMANDS FOR ADDITIONS TO OPTION III. UK REP SAID THAT THE EAST WOULD ONLY DECLINE TO REPLY UNTIL THE ALLIES HAD PROVIDED FIGURES, FRG REP SAID THE OFFER NEEDED PRECISE NUMBERS IN ORDER TO PUT OPTION III ON A TAKE-IT-OR-LEAVE-IT BASIS. ITALIAN REP SAID ALLIES COULD BE PRECISE ABOUT CATEGORIES, WITHOUT GIVING THE EAST NUMBERS AT THE OUTSET. BELGIAN REP SAID HE WOULD REPORT TO HIS AUTHORITIES THE REACTION TO THE BELGIAN PROPOSAL.

8. THE FOLLOWING IS THE TEXT OF PARAS 1 TO 3 OF DRAFT GUIDANCE AS IT EMERGED FROM THIS SPC MEETING.
SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 03614 01 OF 02 071942Z

9. BEGIN TEXT

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 03614 02 OF 02 072011Z

66
ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 EUR-12 H-02 INR-07

IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 BIB-01 SSO-00

NSCE-00 INRE-00 USIE-00 MC-02 /085 W
---------- 079908
O R 171850Z JUL 75
FM USMISSION NATO
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2593
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA IMMEDIATE
AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 3614

MBFR: DRAFT GUIDANCE ON INTRODUCTION OF NUCLEAR AND OTHER
NEW ELEMENTS INTO THE NEGOTIATIONS

1. IN THEIR OUTLINE OF PROPOSALS PRESENTED ON 22ND NOVEMBER, 1973, AND SUBSEQUENTLY, THE ALLIES PROPOSED, INTER ALIA, THAT, IN PHASE I THERE SHOULD BE REDUCTIONS OF US AND SOVIET FORCES AND A COMMITMENT BY BOTH SIDES AS TO THE OUTCOME OF REDUCTIONS IN A SECOND PHASE. SPECIFICALLY, THE ALLIES HAVE PROPOSED THAT:

- BOTH SIDES SHOULD UNDERTAKE A COMMITMENT TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF APPROXIMATE PARITY AS THE GOAL OF THE NEGOTIATIONS IN THE FORM OF A COMMON CEILING, APPROPRIATELY DEFINED IN PHASE I, ON OVERALL GROUND FORCE MANPOWER ON EACH SIDE IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS, WHICH WOULD BE COMPLETED IN PHASE II. THIS COLLECTIVE COMMON CEILING (MIGHT) (WOULD) BE SET AT APPROXIMATELY 700,000 SOLDIERS ON EACH SIDE;

- THE UNITED STATES WOULD WITHDRAW FROM THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS
SECRET

29,000 US SOLDIERS;

1 THE SOVIET UNION WOULD WITHDRAW FROM THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS A TANK ARMY CONSISTING OF 5 DIVISIONS INCLUDING SOME 68,000 SOVIET SOLDIERS AND 1,700 MAIN BATTLE TANKS.

THE ALLIES ARE NOW OFFERING, PROVIDED ALL THESE GOASL ARE AGREED IN PHASE I OF THE NEGOTIATIONS, THAT:

- THE UNITED STATES WOULD WITHDRAW, AS A SPECIAL ADD-ON TO THE WESTERN REDUCTION CONTRIBUTION, A SUBSTANTIAL PORTION OF ITS NUCLEAR CAPABILITY IN CENTRAL EUROPE, NAMELY 1,000 NUCLEAR WARHEADS, 54 US NUCLEAR CAPABLE F-4 AIRCRAFT AND 36 US PERSHING BALLISTIC MISSILE LAUNCHERS;

(- THE COLLECTIVE COMMON CEILING WOULD BE EXTENDED TO INCLUDE AIR MANPOWER IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS, RESULTING IN A COMMON CEILING WHICH (MIGHT) (WOULD) BE SET AT APPROXIMATELY 900,000 MEN)

2. IN PUTTING FORWARD THIS PROPOSAL, THE ALLIED NEGOTIATORS SHOULD MAKE CLEAR THAT ALL OTHER ELEMENTS OF THE ALLIED POSITION PREVIOUSLY PUT FORWARD TO THE EAST REMAIN UNCHANGED.

3. AS REGARDS TACTCS THE ALLIED NEGOTIATORS SHOULD, AS SOON AS

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006

PRACTICABLE, PUT FORWARD ALL THE PROPOSALS IN PARAGRAPH 1
ABOVE SIMULTANEOUSLY. THE NUCLEAR ELEMENTS SHOULD NOT BE SEPARATED.
IN MAKING THEIR PRESENTATION, THE ALLIED NEGOTIATORS SHOULD STRESS
THE GREAT IMPORTANCE OF THIS MOVE AND REQUEST THAT THE EASTERN
PARTICIPANTS GIVE A CONSIDERED RESPONSE. THEY SHOULD MAKE IT CLEAR
THAT THESE PROPOSALS ARE BEING PUT FORWARD AS A ONE-TIME OFFER
TO OBTAIN EASTERN AGREEMENT TO THE ALLIED NEGOTIATING GOALS. THEY
SHOULD ALSO STATE THAT, WHILE THIS NEW ALLIED MOVE TAKES INTO
ACCOUNT EASTERN CONCERNS ABOUT NUCLEAR AND AIR ELEMENTS, THE ALLIES
CONTINUE TO CONCENTRATE IN THE NEGOTIATIONS ON REDUCING THE DISPARITY
IN GROUND FORCE MANPOWER AND TANKS, WHICH IS THE MAJOR
DESTABILIZING FACTOR IN CENTRAL EUROPE. ALLIED NEGOTIATORS
SHOULD ALSO EMPHASIZE THAT THIS EXCHANGE WOULD CONSTITUTE A UNIQUE
TRADE AND THAT IT IS NOT BEING PUT FORWARD AS A STEP TOWARDS
FURTHER REDUCTIONS IN NUCLEAR OR AIR FORCES OR IN EQUIPMENT.
END TEXT

SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 03614 02 OF 02 072011Z

10. PARA 1 OF THE ABOVE TEXT CONSISTS OF PARA 1 OF THE PREVIOUS
IS TEXT, (REF A), INCORPORATING THE CHANGES REQUESTED IN REF B.
PARA 2 IS THE ORIGINAL US PARA 2. PARA 3 REPRESENTS MODIFICATION
OF THE OLD PARA 3 IN LIGHT OF PARAS 4 TO 7, REF B. IN THE LAST
SENTENCE OF PARA 3, THE PHRASE "AND THAT IT IS NOT BEING PUT
FORWARD AS A STEP TOWARDS FURTHER REDUCTIONS IN NUCLEAR OR
AIR FORCES OR IN EQUIPMENT" REPRESENTS EFFORT TO RECONCILE US
VIEW ON THE OLD "PLUS" PARA IN REF A, AND THE UK, FRG, BELGIAN,
DUTCH AND ITALIAN VIEWS THAT THE ALLIES NEEDED SOME REFERENCE TO
THIS IN THE GUIDANCE, ALTHOUGH THE SUPPLEMENT COULD BE MORE
EXPLICIT ON THIS POINT.

11. SINCE THE UK PAPER ON CEILINGS, AND THE US DRAFT SUPPLEMENT
ON ADDITIONAL ASPECTS OF THE ALLIED POSITION, WILL BE REVIEWED
AGAIN TRILATERALLY, WE DO NOT INTEND TO PRESS FOR DISCUSSION OF
THE PARAGRAPHS ON CEILINGS IN THE US DRAFT GUIDANCE THIS WEEK.
THIS IS ALSO PREFERENCE OF FRG REP, WHO ATTENDED THE BONN
TRILATERALS ON JULY 4.

12. ACTION REQUESTED: GUIDANCE ON THE ABOVE TEXT IN TIME FOR
SPC MEETING THURSDAY JULY 10.
BRUCE

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 18 AUG 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 07 JUL 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: GolinoFR
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975NATO03614
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t197507102/abbrzkwr.tel
Line Count: 262
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 5
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A) USNATO 3560 DTG 031310Z JULY 75; B) STATE 158900
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: GolinoFR
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 01 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <01 APR 2003 by IzenbeI0>; APPROVED <02 APR 2003 by GolinoFR>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
06 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: OPTION III: SPC MEETING JULY 7
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO MBFR VIENNA
BONN
LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006

Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006